

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed February 23, 2010 (“Office Action”). Claims 1-11 and 15-23 are pending and rejected in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action of all pending claims in view of the following.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 9-10, 16, and 21-23. Support for these amendments may be found at, but are not limited to, the Specification at page 1, lines 21-25, and page 10, line 21, to line 20.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1-10, 15-18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the Office Action asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse these rejections. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the pending Application towards allowance, Applicants have amended Claims 1-10, 15-18, and 21-23 as requested in the most recent *Office Action*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection and allowance of the pending claims.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-11 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143755 to Wynblatt et al (“*Wynblatt*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 is allowable because *Wynblatt* does not teach, expressly or inherently, “a relational mapper . . . configured to translate the relational query requesting network management information . . . to native protocol messages according to an access protocol associated with the network device.” ***Wynblatt* does not provide any teachings on network management, let alone a “a relational mapper . . . configured to translate the relational query requesting network management information.”**

Wynblatt teaches database queries requesting information from multiple “data sources” spread across a network. *Wynblatt*, at para. 0052. “[E]ach data source is viewed as one or more database records (relational model) or object instances (object-oriented model) or some combination thereof, and in which the schema described above is used.” *Wynblatt*,

para. 0052. For example, *Wynblatt*'s paragraphs 0061-0065 describe an "exemplary query" configured "for a factory automation environment where the location of those containers meeting certain requirements are requested to be selected." This is not network management information, which would include information allowing the software application to monitor, control, and configure devices on a network remotely via the network. Accordingly, the *Wynblatt* reference does not teach translating the relational query requesting network management information.

As evidence of *Wynblatt*'s alleged "translating," the Patent Office cites *Wynblatt* at paragraph 0052, but this is incorrect. Paragraph 0052 merely teaches decomposing database queries into multiple queries corresponding to multiple database data sources located throughout a network. *Wynblatt*, para. 0052 ("This system extracts the relevant parts of the [traditional database] query for each data source, so that it may be sent to the data source."). *Wynblatt* is wholly silent regarding any relational mapper configured to translate the relational query requesting network management information to native protocol messages according to an access protocol associated with the network device.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 and its dependents are allowable. Independent Claims 9, 10, 11, 21, 22, and 23 and their dependents are allowable for analogous reasons.

No Waiver

All of Applicant's arguments are without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to discuss the distinctions between the applied art and the claims in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicant are sufficient to overcome the rejections.

Request for Evidentiary Support

Should any of the above asserted rejections be maintained, Applicant respectfully requests appropriate evidentiary support. Additionally, if the Examiner is relying upon "common knowledge" or "well known" principles to establish a rejection, Applicant requests that a reference be provided in support of this position pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner maintains any rejection based on an "Official Notice" or other information within the Examiner's personal knowledge, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite a reference as documentary evidence in support of this position or provide an affidavit in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 and 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2).

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present Application may be advanced in any way by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney, Bradley P. Williams, at 214-953-6447.

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Examiner is authorized to charge any fee required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40,227
Phone: (214) 953-6447

Date: 5/17/10

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: 05073